

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated December 3, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claim 1 and 24 is hereby amended. Accordingly, claims 1–26 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that claims 13–23 and 25 are allowed; objects to claims 2–8 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim; rejects claims 1, 9–12, 24, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,124,919 to Kubo et al. (hereinafter “Kubo”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,667,788 to Maruyama et al. (hereinafter “Maruyama”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,829,029 to Davis et al. (hereinafter “Davis”).

Applicant appreciates the indication from the Examiner that claims 13–25 and 25 are allowed, and that claims 2–8 contain allowable subject matter.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 9–12, 24, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubo in view of Maruyama in view of Davis. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests reconsideration in that the combination of Kubo, Maruyama, and Davis fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claim 1. For example, independent claim 1 recites a “holographic film for reducing an angle of light incident to the polarizer.” Nothing in Kubo, Maruyama, or Davis, singly or in combination, teaches at least this feature of the claimed invention. The Examiner cites Davis as teaching this element. However, Davis teaches “a polarisation selective holographic element” such that “a circular polariser ... may be replaced by a polarisation selective holographic element which may be arranged to transmit circularly polarised light of a particular handedness, or to transmit plane polarised light which is converted to circularly polarised light by a quarter wave plate ... The light which is not transmitted by the polarisation selective holographic element is reflected.” (Col. 4, ll. 60–67). Applicant respectfully submits that this does not teach or suggest a “holographic film for reducing an angle of light incident to the polarizer.” Accordingly,

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, and claims 9–12 and 26, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over Kubo, Maruyama, and Davis.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 24 and request reconsideration for the same or similar reasons as that regarding claim 1. Specifically, claim 24 is allowable over Kubo, Maruyama, and Davis in that it recites a “holographic film for reducing an angle of light incident to the polarizer.” Nothing in Kubo, Maruyama, or Davis, singly or in combination, teaches at least this feature of the claimed invention. As discussed above, Davis teaches “a polarisation selective holographic element is reflected”. Applicant respectfully submits that this element of Davis is not a “holographic film for reducing an angle of light incident to the polarizer” as recited in the claims of the present application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 24 is allowable over Kubo, Maruyama, and Davis.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

Application No.: 10/026,483
Amdt. dated March 2, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated December 3, 2004

Docket No.: 8733.575.00

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: March 2, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Rebecca Goldman Rudich

Registration No.: 41,786
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant

DC:50314294.1